



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/921,785	08/03/2001	Thomas Lopatic	14616	7412

7590 10/06/2008
Scully, Scott, Murphy & Presser
400 Garden City Plaza
Garden City, NY 11530

EXAMINER

KUCAB, JAMIE R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3621

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

10/06/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/921,785	Applicant(s) LOPATIC, THOMAS	
	Examiner JAMIE KUCAB	Art Unit 3621	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 June 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 76, 77, 79 and 81-98 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 76, 77, 79, 81-98 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Acknowledgements

1. Applicant's response filed June 26, 2008 is acknowledged.
2. Claims 76, 77, 79, and 81-98 are pending in the application.
3. This Office action is given Paper No. 20080929 for reference purposes only.
4. Based on a comparison of the PGPub US 20020138441 A1 with Applicant's originally submitted specification, the PGPub appears to be a fair and accurate record of the Applicant's specification. Therefore, if necessary any references in this action to Applicant's specification refer to paragraph numbers in the PGPub.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
6. Claims 76, 77, 79, 81-98 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention.
7. Regarding claims 76 and 98, Applicant's recitation "wherein the identification of the one or more instructions and/or one or more variables is based on information obtained from an initial or an intermediate state of the creation process resulting in the executable file" would have been unclear to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. First, "based on information obtained from" is overly broad and fails to convey the relationship between the information and the identification step.

Second, as worded, the “information” includes not only object code or source code but also executable code, as executable code is “based on” object and source code.

However, this does not appear to be Applicant’s intent based on the changes to the limitation of now-cancelled claim 78 as amended into claim 76. Appropriate clarification and/or correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 76, 77, 79, 81-98 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Krishnan et al. (U.S. 6,141,698 hereinafter “Krishnan”) in view of Horning et al. (U.S. 2005/0183072 hereinafter “Horning”).

10. Regarding claims 76, 98, Krishnan discloses a method/processor-readable medium of automatically modifying an executable file comprising the steps of: identifying one or more instructions and/or one or more variables within the executable file; inserting data and/or one or more instructions within said executable file before or after said identified one or more instructions and/or one or more variables, whereby any inserted instructions implements license verification code and any inserted data is license related; and relocating all instructions and all variables within said executable file affected by the insertion, and adjusting all references to the relocated instructions

and/or variables to reflect the relocating of the affected instructions and variables [see summary of the invention; 3:55-6:27, injection mechanism modifying the behavior of existing executable code].

11. However, Krishnan fails to explicitly disclose wherein the identification of the one or more instructions and/or one or more variables is based on information obtained from an initial or an intermediate state of the creation process resulting in the executable file.

12. Horning teaches wherein the identification of the one or more instructions and/or one or more variables is based on information obtained from an initial or an intermediate state of the creation process resulting in the executable file [object code, Abstract, Fig. 2 and associated text].

13. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply the technique of considering object code as taught by Horning, to improve the method of Krishnan for the predictable result of increased efficiency in modifying an executable file.

14. Regarding claim 77, Krishnan/Horning discloses the method according to claim 76, characterized in that at least part of the data and/or the one or more instructions inserted within the executable file enable automatic testing of the integrity of at least one part of the executable file [Krishnan, 4:37-55, verifying checksums, see Fig 9 and associated text].

15. Regarding claim 78, Krishnan/Horning discloses the method according to claim 76, characterized in that the identification of the one or more instructions and/or one or more variables is based on information obtained from at least one of an initial,

intermediate and final state of the creation process resulting in the executable file

[Krishnan, Figs 11, 14 and associated text; columns 11-12].

16. Regarding claim 79, Krishnan/Horning discloses the method according to claim 76, characterized in that the information is obtained from object files created in the process of generating the executable file from a source code file [Horning, Abstract, Fig. 2 and associated text].

17. Regarding claim 81, Krishnan/Horning discloses the method according to claim 76, characterized in that the information is obtained from relocation information created in the process of generating the executable file from a source code file [Krishnan, Fig 11 and 14 and associated text, location information].

18. Regarding claim 82, Krishnan/Horning discloses the method according to claim 76, characterized in that the data and/or the one or more instructions inserted in the executable file enable an identification of a licensee of the software product comprising the executable file [Krishnan, columns 7-8, license information].

19. Regarding claim 83, Krishnan/Horning discloses the method according to claim 76, characterized in that the data and/or the one or more instructions inserted in the executable file enable an identification of the executable file itself [Krishnan, Fig 3 and 9 and associated text, location/ID executable file].

20. Regarding claim 84, Krishnan/Horning discloses the method according to claim 76, characterized in that the data and/or the one or more instructions inserted in the executable file enable an identification of a master file from which the executable file

forms a copy before being modified [Krishnan, 8:41-65, 13:18-38, also see main entry discussion in spec and claims]

21. Regarding claim 85, Krishnan/Horning discloses the method according to claim 76, characterized in that the one or more instructions inserted in the executable file create a query to an execution control software program for a permission to run the executable file, and the one or more inserted instructions control the execution of the executable file in accordance to the permission being granted or denied [Krishnan, Col. 2-3, Fig 11 and associated text, col. 11-13, determining whether product is licensed].

22. Regarding claim 86, Krishnan/Horning discloses the method according to claim 76, characterized in that the one or more instructions inserted in the executable file monitor changes to the executable file and the one or more inserted instructions create a message indicating an infringement of the integrity of the executable file upon a change not being verified [Krishnan, column 12, discussion of flag].

23. Regarding claim 87, Krishnan/Horning discloses the method according to claim 85, characterized in that granting the permission to run the executable file comprises validation information in form of a request ticket [Krishnan, determining validation of key, column 7].

24. Regarding claim 88, Krishnan/Horning discloses the method according to claim 85, characterized in that the permission to run the executable file is formed by a runtime ticket [Krishnan, 4:1-55].

25. Regarding claim 89, Krishnan/Horning discloses the method according to claim 85, characterized in that the one or more instructions inserted in the executable file receive a log-off ticket and the one or more inserted instructions insert the log-off ticket within the executable file [Krishnan, columns 1-2, turning off features].

26. Regarding claim 90, Krishnan/Horning discloses the method according to claim 89, characterized in that the one or more instructions inserted in the executable file is further adapted to return the log-off ticket to the execution control software program upon terminating the execution of the executable file [Krishnan, Fig 4, adapted to terminate application].

27. Regarding claim 91, Krishnan/Horning discloses the method according to claim 87, characterized in that the one or more instructions inserted in the executable file comprises verification code for verifying the validity of at least one type of ticket [Krishnan, Fig 9, verification code].

28. Regarding claim 92, Krishnan/Horning discloses the method according to claim 85, characterized in that the one or more instructions inserted in one or more instructions of the executable file increment a counter related to the respective instruction each time said instruction of the executable file is involved [Krishnan, col. 11-12, counter/flag mechanism].

29. Regarding claim 93, Krishnan/Horning discloses the method according to claim 92, characterized in that said one or more instructions inserted in one or more instructions of the executable file send data concerning the value of the counter to the

execution control software program upon terminating the execution of the executable file [Krishnan, Fig 14 and associated text, col. 4-6, import data].

30. Regarding claim 94, Krishnan/Horning discloses the method according to claim 87, characterized in that the one or more instructions inserted in the executable file comprises means for an execution of code received from the execution control software program [Krishnan, col. 1-3 and 9, means of injection/execution].

31. Regarding claim 95, Krishnan/Horning discloses the method according to claim 94, characterized in that the one or more instructions inserted in the executable file comprises means for returning a result of the execution of said code to said execution control software program [Krishnan, col. 11-14, checksum result].

32. Regarding claim 96, Krishnan/Horning discloses the method according to claim 76, characterized by at least one of changing an arrangement of at least two subroutines and changing the arrangement of at least two variables within the executable file [Krishnan, col. 11-15, blocks/determinations routines].

33. Regarding claim 97, Krishnan/Horning discloses the method according to claim 96, characterized in that the changing of the arrangement of the at least two subroutines and the changing of the at least two variables is performed by a pseudo-random permutation [Krishnan, 12:48-13:17].

Examiner Note

34. The Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the Applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings in the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may be applied as well. It is respectfully requested from the Applicant, in preparing responses, to fully consider the reference in its entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

Response to Arguments

35. With regard to Applicant's contention that claim 78 provides support for the current amendment, it is noted that claim 78 is not part of the original specification, and, therefore, cannot serve as support for a claim amendment. However, Applicant's effort to point to support for the current amendment is appreciated, as such a practice saves time for both applicants and examiners.

36. Regarding Applicant's arguments that the newly added limitations overcome the prior art, these arguments are moot in view of the new rejections above.

Conclusion

37. Applicant's amendment filed June 26, 2008 necessitated the new grounds of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, this action is made final. See

MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 C.F.R. §1.136(a).

38. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire three months from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within two months of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the three-month shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than six months from the mailing date of this final action.

39. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Jamie Kucab whose telephone number is 571-270-3025. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:30am-6:00pm EST. If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Andrew Fischer can be reached on 571-272-6779. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

40. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JK

/ANDREW J. FISCHER/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3621